

raised therein. In view of the foregoing amendments and the comments which follow, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Abstract of the Disclosure was objected to as containing multiple grammatical errors. In response, the Abstract of the Disclosure has been amended as shown above.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, as being indefinite by including the term "excessive". In response, claims 1 and 11 have been amended as shown above to eliminate the use of the term "excessive".

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-5 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by either Granot or Drori.

The Granot patent is directed to a filter having a multi disc filter median. To facilitate self-cleaning, the fluid is reversed and the discs de-energized which allows the fluid to flow over the discs. No reverse flow through the median to dislodge trapped particles and carry them away to backwash with the fluid is provided by Granot. On the other hand, this is the direct focus of the present invention as claimed, and therefore applicant submits that claims 1-5 and 8-10 are not anticipated by Granot.

The Drori patent shows a filter having a rotary system driven by the back flush flow to spray the external area of the filter cartridge. There is no reverse flow through the median. A cartridge is rotated to provide for a consisting cleaning affect on the periphery of the cartridge. The particles dislodged are then carried to the backwash with the fluid. In view of the failure of either Granot or Drori to teach the reversed flow through the median, Applicant submits that the present invention as claimed in claims 1-5 and 8-10 is not anticipated by these references. Favorable reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.


In paragraph 8, claims 6, 7 and 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over either Granot or Drori in view of Rosenberg and one of Kawai et al or Raifman.

The Rosenberg patent shows a multi disc type filter but has no teaching whatsoever of a self-cleaning mechanism. The same holds true for the Kawai et al and Raifman references. Consequently, Applicant submits that neither Rosenberg, Kawai et al nor Raifman cure the deficiencies of either Granot or Drori as set forth previously with regard to claims 1-5 and 8-10 as discussed previously, and therefore claims 6 and 7 should be considered patentable over the art of record. With regard to claims 11-16, Applicant submits that these claims are not anticipated by the art of record in view of the failure of these references to teach the limitations as discussed with regard to claims 1-5 and 8-10, namely the reverse flow through the median.

In view of the foregoing arguments, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Submitted herewith is a petition for a three month extension of time extending the period for response up to and including November 26, 1999. Applicant hereby petitions for any other extensions of time and you are authorized to charge Deposit Account 08-2455 any other fees necessary to maintain the pendency of the present application. If any issues remain which can best be solved by a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


Douglas W. Robinson
Reg. No. 32,751

November 26, 1999
(703) 415-0100

Attorney Docket No: A-5816.AMB/cat